IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.R.No. 4827 of 2006

Date of decision : 14.9.2006.

Bhag Chand and Anr.

.....Petitioners.

Versus

Maya Devi.

.....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD K. SHARMA

Present : Mr. Parveen Hans, Advocate
for the petitioners.

****

VINOD K. SHARMA,J.(ORAL)

The present revision petition has been filed against the order dated 5.8.2006 passed by the learned Civil Judge (Jr.Divn.),Hansi vide which the application filed by the respondent/plaintiff for the restoration of the suit has been allowed and the suit was ordered to be restored.

The learned trial Court on appreciation of documents and evidence produced on record came to the conclusion that there was sufficient ground for restoration of the suit.

The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the suit was barred by limitation and as there was no application moved by the petitioner for condonation of delay, the suit could not have been restored. The learned Court below on issue No.3 has held that sufficient reasons have been shown for not filing the application within the time

prescribed and, therefore, the delay in filing the application was condoned no prejudice has been caused to the petitioners so as to entitle this Court to exercise supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

Dismissed.

September 14,2006 **(VINOD K. SHARMA)**
'sp' **JUDGE**